Vinson&Elkins

Clifford Thau cthau@velaw.com **Tel** +1.212.237.0012 **Fax** +1.917.849.5321

December 2, 2022

Via ECF

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe United States District Court Southern District of New York 40 Foley Square, Room 2204 New York, New York 10007

Re: Pre-Motion Opposition Letter—Augenbaum v. RC Ventures, et al., No. 22 Civ. 9327 (S.D.N.Y. 2022)

Dear Judge Gardephe:

Pursuant to Individual Rule of Practice IV.A, defendant RC Ventures LLC ("RC Ventures") respectfully submits this letter in response to the pre-motion letter filed by Todd Augenbaum ("Plaintiff"). See Letter, Augenbaum v. RC Ventures, et al., No. 22 Civ. 9327 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 29, 2022), ECF No. 13 (the "Pre-Motion Letter" or "Pl. Ltr."). Plaintiff seeks leave to move for partial summary judgment or (alternatively) to lift the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act's (the "PSLRA") automatic discovery stay while RC Ventures' anticipated motion to dismiss is pending. See Pl. Ltr. at 1. The Court should deny these requests.

<u>Summary Judgement</u>. For the reasons stated more fully in RC Ventures' pre-motion letter in the related case, *see* Letter, *Cohen v. Cohen, et al.*, No. 22 Civ. 9733 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 29, 2022), ECF No. 16 ("**Def. Ltr.**"), summary judgement is premature before RC Ventures tests the complaint's legal sufficiency via a motion to dismiss, *see Toussie v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 213 F. Supp. 3d 444, 446 (E.D.N.Y. 2016). ¹

<u>PSLRA Discovery Stay</u>. The PSLRA "discourage[es] frivolous litigation" by staying discovery while a motion to dismiss is pending. Lander v. Hartford Life & Annuity Ins. Co., 251 F.3d 101, 107 (2d Cir. 2001). Courts only lift the stay if "discovery is necessary to preserve evidence or to prevent undue prejudice. ." 78u–4(b)(3)(B). Plaintiff falls far short of these requirements. The Pre-Motion Letter does not allege that evidence will disappear. Rather, the Pre-Motion Letter asserts that the discovery stay should be lifted because RC Ventures' contemplated motion to dismiss lacks merit. Pl. Ltr. at 1. Plaintiff's unwarranted optimism that the complaint will survive a motion to dismiss, and that he will eventually receive discovery, does not negate the PSLRA's stay. See, e.g., NECA-IBEW Pension Tr. Fund v. Bank of Am. Corp., 2011 WL 6844456, at *3. (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 29, 2011) ("This argument, devoid of any

¹ The Augenbaum and Cohen actions assert substantially identical claims and should be consolidated. See Def. Ltr. at 1.



Hon. Paul G. Gardephe December 2, 2022 Page 2

specifics, can be used in virtually every case subject to the PSLRA and, if accepted, would create an exception that would swallow the PSLRA's automatic discovery stay.").

Given the above, the Cohen Defendants request that the Court deny Plaintiff leave to move for partial summary judgment and leave to move to lift the PSLRA's stay on discovery.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Clifford Thau
Clifford Thau
VINSON & ELKINS LLP
1114 Avenue of Americas
New York, NY 10036
Telephone: (212) 237-0000

Facsimile: (212) 237-0100 Email: cthau@velaw.com

Attorneys for RC Ventures LLC